

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/819,669

Applicant(s)

Boon et al.

Examiner

Thomas Cunningham

Group Art Unit

1644



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas Cunningham(3) Christina Chan(2) Norman Hanson(4) Richard SchwartzDate of Interview Dec 22, 1998Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Office apologizes for any misinterpretation of the original restriction requirement or letter of 12/8/98. The letter was sent to clarify the record regarding the prior election and to notify applicant that the new sequence listing which amends and corrects particular the sequences set forth by particular SEQ ID NOS. was not in compliance. It is noted that claim 177 (which is not directed to MAGE-1) was improperly grouped with Group I in the original restriction requirement. The Office appreciates the Applicant's reconfirmation that the prior election was a response to the written restriction requirement of record in which the claims of Group I (as directed to MAGE-1) were elected without traverse. Applicant agreed to consider perfecting the corrected sequence listing within the time period set forth in the letter mailed 12/8/98 (Paper No. 16).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

TC
THOMAS M. CUNNINGHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.